

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 10, and 12 are presently active in this case. Claims 1, 10, and 12 are amended, and Claims 8 and 9 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment.

Applicants and Applicants' representative thank Examiner James M. McAleenan for the courtesies extended during a telephone conversation conducted on May 19, 2004, during which the Examiner clarified several issues with regard to the outstanding Office Action and amendments to Claims 1, 10, and 12 incorporated herein were agreed upon as distinguishing over the cited references.

Additionally, the outstanding Office Action suggests amendments to overcome prior art including Applicants' submitted prior art, JA 60001471, and JA 0022002. JA 0022002 is noted as not being made of record (see Office Action at page 2, paragraph 1). As the amendments proposed by the Examiner were suggested in light of this reference, Applicants respectfully submit that the reference has been made of record and request that JA 0022002 be listed on a supplemental PTO-892 form.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Allen (U.S. Patent No. 4,063,845). Claims 7-12 were also noted as rejected by the Office Action. However, Applicants note that Claims 7 and 11 were cancelled in a previously filed response. The Examiner clarified during the interview that Claims 8, 9, and 10 were intended to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by North (U.S. Patent No. 4,902,198) for reasons disclosed in the previous Office Action. Additionally, it was also

clarified that Claim 12 was intended to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Allen. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the art rejections.

Claims 1 and 12 are amended to incorporate the limitations agreed upon during the above-noted telephone interview. Applicants further note that Claims 1 and 12 are amended in substantially the same manner as suggested by the Examiner with respect to Claim 1 in the outstanding Office Action. As discussed during the interview, the amendments to Claims 1 and 12 set forth herein distinguish over the cited references, including Allen and JA 60001471. More specifically, neither reference teaches or suggests at least side end wall surfaces having blowoff openings for blowing cooling air into gaps, as explicitly recited in amended Claims 1 and 12.


Moreover, as stated in the outstanding Office Action dated February 19, 2004, at page 2, paragraph 1, support for the amendments contained herein can be found at least at page 16, line 17 of the specification. Additionally, the amendment to Claim 10 was agreed upon during the telephone conversation and is supported by at least originally filed Claim 8. Thus, no new matter is added.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the art rejection of Claims 1-6, 10, and 12.

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Christopher D. Ward
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)